

Howe Martyn

INTERNATIONAL TOURISM:

PUBLIC ATTITUDES AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES

OFFICIALS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS are now asking the question put by Robert Bridges in *A Passer-by*: "Whither away, fair rover, and what thy quest?" To travel without question had been one of the essentials of political freedom. Freedom of travel was one of the objectives, for example, of the liberalization movement in Czechoslovakia as recently as 1968.

Government policies of "laisser-passer" have not been common or long-standing, any more than other freedoms. The Czars restricted both entrance into and exit from Russia, and the Communists have done likewise. The Moslems kept Christians out of the Arabian peninsula, and the Buddhists kept them out of Tibet. China and Japan kept out all foreigners. Government intervention in travel is again on the increase. In addition to restrictions on departures, now imposed in more countries—formerly free Britain for example—and in addition to and in contrast with restrictions on arrivals made to keep out spies and agitators and to limit immigration, there are now vigorous efforts by many governments to attract visitors. A government such as that of the Greek colonels may attempt all three interventions at once—to keep in Greeks, to keep out reporters, and still to attract tourists.

The basis of government involvement has been the economics of tourism, a source of income for some countries, of outgo for others, and of both for Britain, Canada, France, Germany, and others, as well as the United States, for which a temporary, secondary basis of government policy was the idea that tourists could be missionaries for the American way of life. This idea influenced the benign attitude of Washington in the 1950s, when the United States had a surplus of gold and foreign currencies. In the economics of tourism, there are special advantages for countries seeking to improve their position with respect to international payments. Earnings from tourism have a higher net yield than many physical exports because these latter are likely

to require offsetting imports of raw materials, components, and equipment. Goods supplied to tourists are usually accompanied by an exceptionally high charge that is added for services, for a steak, for example, served in a gaily decorated restaurant by a smart waitress to the accompaniment of an orchestra. Such participation in rising levels of processing of raw materials is important for economic development, as well as for obtaining higher foreign-exchange earnings from a country's natural resources than are obtained from raw exports. A tourist industry can often be developed more quickly and with less need for scarce capital than from industries that make physical exports, whether from natural resources or manufactures. This knowledge has been slow, however, to reach some governments. It is almost incredible that in 1966, in a program intended to strengthen sterling, the government of Britain imposed a "selective employment tax" on services, when tourism was its largest source of dollars and its fourth largest source of foreign exchange of all kinds.

The economic focus of governments on international tourism is narrowed by crude mercantilism and selfish Keynesianism. The gain or drain of foreign exchange created by tourism preoccupies Treasury officials. In some countries this is a matter of providing purchasing power for the machinery of economic growth. In advanced countries, however, it is a matter of seeking surpluses in trade for governments to spend in aid, or—more often—in buying influence or in military activities. The economics of Colbert, who financed the power of France under Louis Quatorze, were understandably congenial to the staff of Charles de Gaulle. Mercantilist pursuit of trade for the sake of the surpluses of currencies that finance armies abroad was equally popular in Lyndon Johnson's White House and Pentagon. This has less relation to human well-being than had Britain's pursuit of power for the sake of trade in the nineteenth century. Americans have slipped back to an earlier nationalism. Concepts of national advantage restrict world progress by being related to advantage over other nations, rather than to advantages for the people of the nation compared with what they had previously. Furthermore, some government interventions are self-defeating. Their only accomplishment is a general lowering of trade. The American surplus in physical exports depends heavily on the freedom of Americans to travel and to make purchases in the countries they visit as tourists.

Selfish Keynesianism, the pursuit of full employment by governments for their own people without effective international co-ordination or consideration of effects in other countries, leads to interference with tourism by governments. They subsidize services for incoming tourists to provide work

for their own people, without thought or scruple about diverting tourists from other countries. They appeal or legislate against travel abroad ("See America First") if they think they can create more jobs at home.

Even for restricted economic purposes, tourism has greater importance than is allowed for in present approaches by governments. The most democratically responsive government often operates beyond the range of its communications with the public. In the short term, therefore, there is no necessary connection between public opinion and what their governments do about tourism. The public may, in fact, have no opinion on such a new development as international tourism on its present world scale. The subject needs discussion, in public and in private. People to whom the public looks for opinions—journalists and university professors as well as officials—must take up the question, supply information, and suggest conclusions. There is likely to be controversy: this will be helpful because it is a means of attracting public attention and getting the public to involve itself. In large and complex societies, concern must spread over a wide range of social groups and geographical areas. After the opinions of individuals begin to form, they must find ways to become vocal, for instance through committees or newspaper editors or congressmen. This process takes considerable time. Helping to speed up the expression of public opinion is one of the great services of the Gallup, Harris, and other polls, but only if there is opinion and there is not too high a "don't-know" percentage. Repercussions of government regulation of tourism have not yet received any thorough consideration among opinion leaders, much less the general public, except for the short-term effects on international payments.

Tolerance of government intervention is apt to exist when there is no opinion. This is a kind of assent, but it may be temporary and it does not constitute approval of specific actions. The public may tolerate government interference with tourism either because it approves the policies of the government in general or in other specific matters, or because it sees no possible alternative government in the immediate future. Tolerance is often based on the assumption that there is expert knowledge and advice available to government that has not been extended to the public, and that they call for action such as interference with tourism.

Eventually, however, positive public approval must be obtained by government, and this requires public understanding. The need for understanding and approval is very clear in the case of international tourism, because gov-

ernment interference depends for effectiveness on the co-operation of large numbers of the public. It is easy for people who do not approve of government interference with tourism to frustrate government efforts, whether to restrict outflow or to promote inflow. The need to promote public understanding is a basic reason why tourism needs to be studied in depth.

Forces pulling in several different directions give governments some of their current leeway to manipulate international tourism. Despite their increase in recent years, people who travel abroad are a minority of the public, even in the richest and most dynamic societies. Those traveling in any one year are a small minority. As toward other minorities, the majority is prone to unfavourable attitudes, especially in times of stress such as wars or economic crises. The travelling minority appears to enjoy pleasures and privileges not enjoyed by the majority. These seem to be obtained entirely with money and without any relation to merit. In general, the stay-at-home majority are working, while the tourists, by definition, are travelling for pleasure. There is ample room for jealousy and resentment.

Another unfavourable factor is that money taken abroad by tourists seems to many people to be gone for ever. As early as the fourteenth century, criticism against "pilgriming"* and carrying "silver over the sea" appeared in *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. Even yet there is very little knowledge about how money can find its way back through international trade and investment.

There are also segments of the public with an interest, as they see it, in preventing foreign travel. People who work or invest in domestic resorts and other tourist facilities can readily conclude that they will profit if travel abroad is restricted. But an increase in domestic travel does not follow automatically. The Grand Canyon may not be an acceptable substitute for the fiords of Norway. Domestic and foreign travel are not completely interchangeable. If nothing else, domestic travel lacks the "foreignness", and some of the motives for foreign travel are different. Nevertheless, vested interests, which including those of airlines that fly only internally, and of bus lines and motor-car and gasoline companies, support restrictions on the theory that there is a fixed total of time and money for holidays each year, and that they can obtain most of whatever is prevented from going abroad.

Favourable factors can also be identified. There are domestic interests in international tourism, based on earnings from employment or investment in travel agencies and in air lines with international routes. People patronize

*See following article, "Jerusalem Journey".—Ed.

travel agencies for foreign vacations when they would not do so for holidays at home. Travel editors get more colourful copy from international tourism, as well as occasional trips for themselves. And while the tourists are a minority, they are also above average in income or education or both and many of them are vocal and have influence in politics or on public opinion. They can appeal to principles that have wider and firmer acceptance than restrictive government policies—the principles of individual freedom and self-determination. Still another factor is that the public can understand that action produces reaction, so that restricting travel from the United States to Canada, for instance, would cause immediate and perhaps greater restrictions on travel, to mutual disadvantage, from Canada to the United States.

Important factors are found in the public attitude toward incoming tourists. Visiting tourists from other countries are foreigners, strangers. One foreign tourist is a curiosity and may be interesting and therefore welcome. Thousands, in a continuing stream, are an invasion. It is still common for people to feel that they have exclusive rights to certain territories for themselves and their families, and that they have additional territorial rights to be shared only with their tribe or nation. Tourists may be regarded as guests; alternatively they may be regarded as intruders if they come without the local residents having any consciousness of having invited them. Tourists in Russia, for example, have frequently been taken for spies, and even where there are no military installations, tourists may be suspected of spying on the weakness of poor countries, and of trying to steal the industrial secrets of rich countries. Tourists are seldom able to avoid the suspicion aroused by their foreignness; but being on holiday they do not feel the need to try to please others. Even if aware, some would not want to bother being considerate: "*caelum, non animus, mutant, qui trans mare currunt*"—they change their skies, not their nature, who travel overseas.²

Added resentment can arise from the lack of personal service in the tourist industry. Britain is said to suffer from "an atavistic disdain for service industries".³ Self-discipline is necessary to accept orders, and this requires training which has not, as yet, been generally given, particularly with respect to foreigners who may be ignorant of local niceties in human relations. Personal service to foreigners is taken as a challenge to the feeling of superiority that people in industrially advanced countries have acquired toward the rest of the world. This is an obstacle to the development of international tourism

petitors are willing to co-operate to promote tourism. A fourth factor is the beneficial effects of tourism that spread throughout an economy. These are becoming known to the general public in some countries, especially the poorer countries where these benefits are relatively greater. The evidence is the acceptability to the public of government promotion of tourism, using public money. But this factor should not be over-weighted because the abstractions in which economic knowledge is frequently expressed hinder popular understanding. A fifth factor in the public attitude is that some people may actually feel pride in the popularity of their region or nation-state that brings tourists to visit them. They feel that they are complimented by this interest.

One more favourable factor is that international influence can be gained through international tourists—both political and commercial influence. This is clearest in the case of students, who carry home friendship and buying habits. There is enough awareness of this to generate both organized and private efforts to help tourists, and especially young people, to see public events and family life. Britain has an Overseas League and a Royal Commonwealth Society whose purposes include making visitors welcome. In France, also, the potential of tourists to become friends and customers of the nation has long been recognized. And in the United States, a contribution to President John F. Kennedy's world-wide influence was made by the receptions he gave in the White House for foreign students visiting Washington.

Some principles that governments can choose to adopt to guide public policy with respect to international tourism can be discerned. Sooner or later, of course, the choice is influenced by the factors discussed above and by their effect on public opinion.

The ancient principle that all foreigners are subversive and **must be** excluded was held by the Empress of China less than 100 years ago, and only given up after the defeat of the Boxers in 1900. The Chinese under Chairman Mao do not make things easy for visitors, but they do not prohibit them. The principle of total exclusion held by the authorities of some holy cities—Mecca and Medina, for example, and Lhasa in Tibet—has also been abandoned. At the other extreme, there is a principle that governments should have nothing to do with tourism one way or another. This is a corollary of free trade, extending to invisible exports and imports. "Laissez-faire" was originally coupled with "laissez-passer", allowing free movement of goods and presumably of people. During the heyday of free trade in the nineteenth century, the people who talked most in its favour because they had the most to gain—the indus-

petitors are willing to co-operate to promote tourism. A fourth factor is the beneficial effects of tourism that spread throughout an economy. These are becoming known to the general public in some countries, especially the poorer countries where these benefits are relatively greater. The evidence is the acceptability to the public of government promotion of tourism, using public money. But this factor should not be over-weighted because the abstractions in which economic knowledge is frequently expressed hinder popular understanding. A fifth factor in the public attitude is that some people may actually feel pride in the popularity of their region or nation-state that brings tourists to visit them. They feel that they are complimented by this interest.

One more favourable factor is that international influence can be gained through international tourists—both political and commercial influence. This is clearest in the case of students, who carry home friendship and buying habits. There is enough awareness of this to generate both organized and private efforts to help tourists, and especially young people, to see public events and family life. Britain has an Overseas League and a Royal Commonwealth Society whose purposes include making visitors welcome. In France, also, the potential of tourists to become friends and customers of the nation has long been recognized. And in the United States, a contribution to President John F. Kennedy's world-wide influence was made by the receptions he gave in the White House for foreign students visiting Washington.

Some principles that governments can choose to adopt to guide public policy with respect to international tourism can be discerned. Sooner or later, of course, the choice is influenced by the factors discussed above and by their effect on public opinion.

The ancient principle that all foreigners are subversive and must be excluded was held by the Empress of China less than 100 years ago, and only given up after the defeat of the Boxers in 1900. The Chinese under Chairman Mao do not make things easy for visitors, but they do not prohibit them. The principle of total exclusion held by the authorities of some holy cities—Mecca and Medina, for example, and Lhasa in Tibet—has also been abandoned. At the other extreme, there is a principle that governments should have nothing to do with tourism one way or another. This is a corollary of free trade, extending to invisible exports and imports. "Laissez-faire" was originally coupled with "laissez-passer", allowing free movement of goods and presumably of people. During the heyday of free trade in the nineteenth century, the people who talked most in its favour because they had the most to gain—the indus-

trialized British—used to tour without any permit papers except their pound notes. Admission of tourists has accumulated in recent years a number of obstacles of inconvenience, but these result from the officiousness of governments. The professed intention of most governments is to encourage visitors. The visas, vaccination certificates, airport taxes, currency declarations, questionnaires, and customs inquisitions result from stupidity rather than any intention to interfere with tourist flow.

There is also the possibility of an absence of principle—total indifference by governments. It was found as recently as 1960 that officials of some governments regarded tourism “as frivolous and superficial and as adding little to the economy”.⁵ By now, presumably, such officials have died or retired.

As a principle, non-intervention requires governments to keep their hands off outgoing as well as incoming tourists. On this principle, some countries must expect and accept losses in invisible trade. These will, in theory, be counterbalanced in the long run by gains in physical exports, or by the necessity to reduce physical imports or political or military outlays. Conversely, surpluses can be maintained in physical exports only if there are counterbalancing deficits in “invisibles”—investment abroad, aid, military expenditures, or tourist expenditures. It has been suggested that a deficit on account of tourism is characteristic of a highly industrialized country: “in 1962, West Germany’s travel deficit totalled [the equivalent of] \$571 million, France’s \$198 million, Belgium-Luxembourg’s \$48 million”.⁶ Canada, rapidly industrializing during and since the Second World War, now has the world’s highest per capita expenditure on travel to other countries, while continuing to obtain large earnings from incoming tourists.

The sovereignty of national governments over every activity of their citizens establishes a principle of over-all government authority and responsibility in the entire field of tourism. Intervention becomes legitimate and proper, and reasons why it is necessary are soon found—to encourage an inflow or restrict an outflow, or to find balance by attempting both at once. On this principle, the only problem is to find practical forms of intervention. But search for a sounder and more effective method than the flashing of red and green lights leads to the principle that tourism should be co-ordinated with other activities in a national economic plan. Such co-ordination requires planning for tourism: “a [government] plan, devised in consultation with the tourist industry . . . is probably the single most important step that any country can take to ensure a balanced program of investment in the development of tourism”.⁷

Going farther than any national government is going as yet is the principle that there should be international co-ordination of the planning of tourism. The nationalistic principle that tourism comes under government management, and growing importance and official awareness of tourism, presage fierce competition among governments to achieve their separately planned national objectives. It could come about that Britain keeps members of the House of Lords in full regalia on duty at London airport to invite Americans and Canadians touching down there to stay on in Britain and not go on to Paris. To corral tourists by direct flights and through tickets is one of the advertised purposes of national airlines—the campaign, for example, of KLM, the Royal Dutch airlines, to book Americans to Amsterdam. Government co-operation is, however, recommended on the grounds that neighbouring nations will share a greater aggregate of tourism if they facilitate and promote combination tours of several countries. One of the reasons given for the pre-eminent popularity of Europe with international tourists is the compact variety offered by the region. The argument is that “what helps to develop tourism in one country tends to aid its development in neighbouring areas”.⁵ This “regional co-operation” may merely lead, however, to intensified competition among the regions of the world, unless there is higher international co-ordination of planning. A step in this direction is represented by the planning of the rotation of authorizations for World’s Fairs made by the International Exhibitions Bureau, in accordance with an international Convention of 1928 (to which the United States had not acceded as late as 1968).

The principle of encouraging incoming tourists finds simple application in the current policy of removing obstacles. Governments relax requirements for visas in passports, as has been done mutually among the countries of Europe, including Britain. Governments may go further and permit border crossings by citizens without passports, as between Canada and the United States. Commencing in 1967, tourists from the United States were no longer required to obtain a permit to take their automobiles into Canada. Changing of money is made easier by increased respect for the tourist trade among banks, both official institutions and those under close government supervision. Limitations on tourists’ personal supplies of alcohol and tobacco, however, still remain strict, and many customs officers still have manners that imply that they regard all tourists as criminals. They can destroy in five minutes all the goodwill that history, literature, and expensive advertising have created for a country among visiting tourists. Governments seeking to effectuate

national policies of tourist promotion must eliminate the popular attitude of suspicion of foreigners that survives in the lower bureaucracy.

Policies of positively encouraging tourism, beyond mere ceasing to discourage, include both improving the product that is offered to visitors, and increasing awareness and concern for their needs. Governments subsidize airlines, build airports, and improve terminal facilities—unloading ramps, reception rooms, bars and restaurants, wash rooms. The airport at Mexico City gives the visitor an immediate impression of the colour and music that distinguish Mexican culture. Highways leading tourists into the countries they are visiting are improved. Billboards and roadside stands are restricted, junk-yards are screened. A need becomes recognized for zoning of tourist centres and their surroundings. For instance, "a hotel nucleus should fit into a given area . . . in such a way that it looks as if it always belonged there".⁴ Government policy gave tourism in Canada a fillip when government-promoted Eskimo and West Coast Indian arts and crafts proved capable of filling a void among objects distinctively expressive of a country that tourists like to buy and take home as remembrances of their travels. Thus a well-guided tourist policy leads to "preservation and interpretation of historical monuments, conservation of sites of outstanding natural beauty, development of music festivals, plastic arts expositions, development of handicraft, improvement of architecture. Thereby it can be made to preserve rather than to disfigure the cultural as well as the physical characteristics of a country".⁴

A policy of attracting attention and arousing interest accompanies or precedes a policy of systematically improving what a country offers to tourists. The two interact: a great stimulus is applied by the experience that attention and interest gain from news of improvements. This accounts for the close association of advertising and innovation in the most economically progressive countries. Potentials of providing benefits to tourists remain unrealized, of course, until people know about them and also feel attracted to them. It is necessary to disseminate knowledge and to colour this knowledge with pleasant emotions. The policy involves the arts of advertising and public relations. These are applied to influential intermediaries, especially travel agents, and to opinion-makers such as journalists, as well as directly to potential tourists themselves. Consequently there evolves a national policy of using advertising and sales promotion in other countries on behalf of tourism.

The principal agencies through which policies toward incoming tourists are developed are leading firms in the tourist industry, associations, and governments. The tourist industry is characterized by a few large firms and a great

many small owner-operators. Long-distance transportation requires large capital and also constitutes the largest single item of expenditure for many tourists. Large companies, such as the airlines, need and can afford to follow a policy of promoting tourism. The same applies to such large-scale hotel-restaurant operations as Hilton International. The numerous small participants can also be made to see common and shared interest in tourism. Ambitious individuals among them, or leaders supplied by governments, establish tourist associations, which tax their members for funds for tourist promotion.

It becomes logical for governments to participate in tourist promotion by the large number of small operators in the industry (a significant political constituency but in some countries not well enough educated or financed to support promotion through the private associations just mentioned) and by the spread of the benefits beyond the tourist industry and throughout the economy. Thus, "entrepreneurs [have come to] expect vigorous action in national and regional promotional and informational programs and in the maintenance of places of tourist interest such as historic sites and national parks".⁷ The logic of government participation obtains empirical support from the finding that "14 out of the 17 countries (of the Pacific and Far East) run their tourism development organizations as part and parcel of government".⁵

Government policy has limits. There are difficulties, for instance, in attempting to standardize charges made to visitors by hotels, restaurants, and the like: "experience in successful tourist centres in Europe shows that government regulation of prices has negative effects".⁵ The fundamental limitation on the effectiveness of government promotion is that "the industry relies on a delicate balance between private initiative and public intervention . . . because the plant required to meet the needs of tourists is necessarily composed of a large number of operating units".⁵ Furthermore a negative or indifferent public attitude frustrates government efforts.

Government promotion needs to start at home with education of the public to regard tourists as invited guests rather than as spies or invaders. This is a continuing, long-term requirement. For immediate action, policy alternatives for governments are first, to subsidize, and second, to take direct action. Subsidies may be granted in the form of tax exemptions, for instance on profits from investment in hotels. Governments also exempt tourists from the sales and purchase taxes imposed on residents, and authorize "duty free" shops at their borders. A subsidy is granted to tourism when governments undertake research on where tourists come from and what they are looking for. This subsidy increases in value with growing appreciation of the power

of knowledge of markets and marketing: "the techniques for increasing tourism constitute, in themselves, a developing art".⁵ Acquiring and disseminating knowledge of these techniques is a heavy expense. A policy of subsidizing may go to the further lengths of investment of government funds in hotels, railways, airlines, chains of service stations, yacht basins and marinas, exhibition halls, and sports facilities, and to meeting deficits on World's Fairs and Olympic Games.

Direct government action is applied to tourist services and goods and to advertising them. Governments create and operate tourist attractions ranging from Canada's "Pioneer Village" on the new north bank of the St. Lawrence Seaway, to Britain's new National Theatre. The nations of Europe have long had state opera and repertory theatre companies and state orchestras as well as houses for them, and attractiveness to tourists is one of the reasons. A policy of active promotion of tourism leads governments to take over the sites of historic events to ensure that they are preserved and kept open to the public. An ingenious British combination of hidden subsidy and direct action is the "National Trust" scheme whereby people who turn over historic or esthetic possessions to public ownership retain life use but avoid severe British inheritance taxes which must be paid in cash and could thus bankrupt their heirs.

Governments also use their money and power to preserve and open to the public national beauty spots, notably the National Parks of the United States. One of the most ambitious government programs is the Rousillon-Languedoc development in France, west of Marseilles on the Mediterranean coast, designed to supplement the Riviera and to relieve congestion there. Eventually this will have accommodation for one million visitors a year.⁸ The French government has eliminated mosquitoes (a grave menace to tourists in bikinis), built ports for pleasure craft, accumulated land for hotels and camping sites, and created a master plan for architecture and landscaping. Communist Bulgaria is considering international as well as domestic tourists in building "three modern and landscaped holiday towns", as shown by Bulgarian advertising abroad for tourists, amounting in Britain alone to 40,000 pounds sterling in 1967.⁹

Advertising and public relations work, aiming to make tourist attractions favourably known abroad, is conducted directly by the governments of mixed and "free enterprise" as well as centrally planned economies. The expenditures for communicating with prospective tourists have become substantial. The combined expenditure of the Canadian federal and provincial governments has been estimated at \$8.7 million for the 1967/8 fiscal year.¹⁰ The work does not

stop with paid advertising and the impact is not measurable by budgets alone. News and feature stories in electronic as well as print media are immensely influential, and they cannot be bought. The work of journalists can, however, be facilitated by the access to information offered by public relations services. These are offered by governments, often in the guise of culture. The pioneering lecture and theatrical tours and exhibitions and accompanying publicity organized by the British Council have been followed by the activities of the French Ministry of Culture and the United States Information Service. There are educational and cultural attachés in some Embassies, and governments aggressively seeking tourists have instructed even dignified ambassadors to cultivate travel editors and other influencers.

Policies of encouraging or assisting tourist outflow are rare indeed, even among such countries, with strong financial reserves and surpluses in their international payments, as the United States immediately after the Second World War and West Germany at the present time. At best the governments of such countries have been neutral, with the particular exception that the government of the United States has made a few small grants to provide advice to underdeveloped countries on how to increase their earnings from international tourism. An example is the financial participation of the United States Department of Commerce in research by Checchi and Company, American management consultants, leading to the report by Harry G. Clement, already cited, on *The Future of Tourism in the Pacific and Far East*. There have, however, been greater efforts by international organizations, which obtain their finances from the governments of member nations. Thus American, French, and German funds can be used to encourage international travel by Americans, French, and Germans. The World Bank group has begun to lend money for building tourist facilities. The United Nations designated 1967 as "International Tourist Year", but the headlines and the money that were sought for peaceful international tourism were taken directly by Vietnam or frozen by the world-wide fear of war.

Negative policies toward tourist outflow are pursued by many governments, some openly, others deviously. They seek at first to discourage their citizens from leaving, and when they fail they impose restrictions with legal force. One way to try to discourage tourist outflow is to try to divert tourists with home attractions. This is the principle of the shopworn campaign "See America First", which appeals mainly to patriots who would not, in any circumstances, wish to go to foreign countries.

Another deliberate discouragement is publicity and education on the main reason why governments wish to restrain tourist outflow: that is to avoid the financial drain. This rational argument requires rational grounds: it does not obtain acceptance when a government's financial difficulties are the obvious results, for example, of Britain's economic extravagance or the military extravagance and diplomatic arrogance of the United States. Governments that have difficulty in obtaining public co-operation can, nevertheless, exert pressure that individuals have difficulty in resisting. Specifically, the processes of obtaining passports and foreign currency or travellers' cheques can be made very laborious with complex forms to complete. The suggestion can also be conveyed that the individual is being put on record for all time in an F.B.I. computerized memory bank in Washington as having gone abroad and consorted with foreigners. These are some of the methods in "voluntary restraint" programs, adopted by an administration when there is doubt that legality for enforcement exists or can be obtained from the legislature and the courts.

Legal power can be used, when a government has it or can obtain it, to impose limits on the amount of currency taken out of a country by a traveller and to impose taxes on transportation. Many governments have imposed currency restrictions, but this has usually been for short periods because it has been found that evasion is cumulative. This has been the experience of Argentina, Brazil, India, and even law-abiding Britain. Valuables such as jewels, rare books, and even stamp collections are bought, smuggled out, and sold abroad. Exporters and investors who have accounts receivable abroad leave the money on deposit for use when they or their friends travel. A black market in foreign currency develops, and the restricting country's receipts from trade and investment suffer. Taxes on tickets for foreign travel put pressure on foreign airlines, dependent on this business, to absorb the taxes in their prices. Where restrictions do not apply, as on American travel to Canada and Mexico under the United States 1968 program, there is nothing to prevent an American from going to Montreal or Vancouver or Mexico City and buying a ticket there for France or Japan or Italy. The most effective financial restraint is devaluation of the currency. This makes foreign travel more expensive, provided that foreign countries do not match the devaluation. Devaluation raised the price of travel in most other countries for Canadians, Israelis, and Filipinos in 1962, and for the British in 1967.

The effects of international tourism are important to the economies of

nations and thus to the employment and income of their people. Policies aimed at the management of tourism are being adopted by governments. The current basis is expediency and narrow national interest. The majority of the public is indifferent toward the promotion of tourism, and restraint concerns only a small minority. Changes are needed. A welcome to incoming tourists from the public is required if tourist promotion is to bring cumulative results. Restrictions on the expenditures or the destinations of outgoing tourists also require public co-operation. There is need for public discussion of the economic, social, and political interactions of tourism, as well as the pleasures and pains of foreign travel.

NOTES

1. See Robert Ardrey, *The Territorial Imperative*, (New York: Atheneum, 1966), [reviewed in *DR*, Vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 255-6].
2. Horace, *Epistles*, XI, to Bullatius, line 27.
3. Egon Ronay, *Times* (London), June 24, 1967.
4. Miguel A. Barasoda, Department of Tourism, Puerto Rico, *Proceedings of Seminar*, San Juan, Feb. 2, 1963.
5. Harry G. Clement, *The Future of Tourism in the Pacific and Far East*, (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 7, xiii.
6. American Express Company, *Travel Spending and the U. S. Balance of Payments* (1965), pp. 15, 16.
7. H. David Davis, "Investing in Tourism", *Fund and Bank Review*, March, 1967, pp. 3, 8, 5, 2.
8. *Financial Times*, March 30, 1967.
9. *Times* (London), July 7, 1967.
10. *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), Aug. 25, 1967, p. B 3.